

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
0
1
2
3
4
5

Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 42-52 stand rejected.

Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 42-52 remain in this application.

A telephonic interview took place on October 16, 2006 between Examiners Laurie Anne Ries and William Bashore, and Emmanuel Rivera. In particular, it was discussed that newly cited reference U.S. Patent 6,175,845 to Smith et al does not teach or suggest a “fixed document” with “multiple pages” as recited in the claims. Examiners Ries and Bashore indicated that additional searching will be performed. It is requested that the Office look to specification as to examples of “fixed digital documents” (e.g., page 3, Fig. 2, Fig. 7).

Claims 1-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, “as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.”

1 **35 U.S.C. §103**

2 **Independent claims 1, 9, 19, 26, 33, 42, 47, and 51** are rejected under 35
3 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,175,845 to Smith (Smith)
4 in view of one or more other references. Furthermore, all the claims that depend
5 upon claims 1, 9, 19, 26, 33, 42, 47, and 51, are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as
6 being unpatentable over Smith in view of one or more other references.

7 As discussed in the telephone interview mentioned above, Smith fails to
8 teach or suggest a “fixed digital document” as recited in the independent claims.
9 The Action refers to col. 5, lines 47-50 as to “obtaining” a “fixed digital
10 document”; however, this section merely teaches that “rendering information can
11 be provided to render and calculate pagination information for content in any
12 number of formats”. There is no teaching or suggestion as to a “fixed digital
13 document”. It was pointed out in the telephone interview, that Smith actually
14 teaches receiving a non-fixed document, such as an html stream, that requires
15 pagination by the “renderer” taught in Smith. See section entitled “Renderer
16 Implementation” and particularly col. 4, lines 14 to 32, of Smith.


17 Accordingly, a combination of Smith and any other reference fails to teach
18 or suggest every element of the claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 42-52, and the
19 rejection of claim 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 42-52 is therefore improper.
20 Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43
21 and 42-52 be withdrawn.

1 Conclusion

2 Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 42-52 are in condition for allowance.
3 Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject
4 application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned
5 attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve
6 any such outstanding matter.

7
8
9 Date: 11/6/06

Respectfully Submitted,

10 By: 
11 Emmanuel Rivera
12 Reg. No. 45,760
13 (509) 324-9256, ext. 245